

CHURCH UNION



NEWS AND VIEWS

AUGUST 1960

Meet the Church of the Brethren

CHURCH UNION

NEWS AND VIEWS

(New Series)

Vol. 5 }

Organ of the Negotiating Committee for Church Union in
North India and Pakistan

{ No. 3

CONTENTS

	Page
Editorial: The Unification Proposals: An Explanation	33
Meet the Church of the Brethren: Rev. A. Holderreed	34
Holy Baptism: "Conscience Cases" Rev. F. Wyld	36
Episcopalian and Presbyterian Orders: Rev. D. H. S. Lyon	37
Baptist Decision in Pakistan	43
Book Reviews: Unity: Hope and Experience;	45
Church of England and Methodists;	46
Islam in India and Pakistan;	47
The Faith we Confess	47
Writers in this number	Cover

Opinions expressed in articles in *Church Union—News and Views* are those of their writers and not necessarily of the Editor or of the Negotiating Committee.

Editor: Rev. William Stewart, Serampore College, Serampore, West Bengal.

Manager: (To whom all subscriptions should be sent)

Miss E. L. Saunders, Masha'l Printing Press, Kharar, District Ambala.

Subscription Rates: India and Pakistan Rs. 2.00 per year.

U. K. and Europe 4s. per year.

U. S. A. and Canada \$ 0.50 per year.

Subscriptions in U. K. and Europe may be paid through the Rev. Frank Short, Edinburgh House, 2 Eaton Gate, London S. W. 1.

Subscriptions in U. S. A. may be paid through Miss G. S. Nyce, 219 Mather Rd.,
Jenkintown, Pa.

Published quarterly in February, May, August and November of each year.

Material should reach the Editor not later than 25th of the month previous to intended publication.

Church Union

News and Views

(New Series)

The Unification Proposals: An Explanation

THE publication of the Resolution of the General Council of the CIPBC giving general approval to the Plan of Union, with an explanatory "Preamble", and the publication of Bishop Blair's article in our May issue to explain the Anglican attitude to Inter-communion, has revived in some quarters discussion as to the actual meaning of the Proposals for the Unification of the Ministry. In this situation it is possible to point to the statement in Para. 13 of Chapter VII of Part II of the Plan, which acknowledges that "there may be different interpretations of this rite...". Many people, however, recalling that that statement was inserted at quite an early stage in the discussions, have found far greater satisfaction in the forthright and positive statements in Para. 14 which make it abundantly plain that the proposal is that it is *God's blessing* which is to be sought, *without discrimination*, on all ministers of the uniting Churches. The notion of a difficulty, as it seems to them, is not lain in any claim that by this means we shall hand on some heritage which is in our possession, but has lain in a willingness to submit to God, being confident that He in His wisdom and love will fit our ministers for their task. In this situation, there may be usefulness in reprinting the following explanation written by the Editor and published in the U.K. in August 1958:

Part II of the Plan, dealing with the inauguration of the Union, contains a provision for "the unification of the ministry" which differs considerably from what was done in South India. The Church of South India accepted as its ministers all ministers in the uniting Churches who accepted the Basis of Union. Their Unification was included in the actual event of Church Union. Many in the North would gladly have followed this

precedent, but it was necessary to recognise that it had not fully satisfied the Anglican Churches, and their representatives pressed for a different solution.

In South India the difficulty was met by a Pledge to respect conscience where a congregation could not accept a minister who had not been episcopally ordained, and by a promise to re-examine the question of episcopal ordination for all, only after a lapse of thirty years. In the North, the hope has been to avoid the need for these provisions and to ensure a "common and united ministry" at the outset. The working out of the proposals has involved much patient labour, but their final form seems more likely than earlier drafts to command approval.

Certain conscientious scruples had to be respected:

(i) To demand of Anglican Churches that they begin by recognising as equal to theirs, ministers not episcopally ordained is to ask them to say that something, which many have counted a necessary feature of ordination, is in fact not so.

(ii) Equally, to demand of non-episcopal Churches that their ministers must needs be ordained by a Bishop, is to ask them to express a doubt about God's gift to them in their ministry which in fact they cannot entertain.

Each demand would call for a prior settlement of the long debate about the necessity of episcopacy.

In spite of this difficulty, agreement has become clear on certain vital matters:

(a) All recognise that in the several Churches, by whatever procedures, men have been ordained ministers of the Word and

Sacraments and that "all their ministries have been in God's providence manifestly used by the Holy Spirit....."

(b) All alike are deeply aware of the truth that, for the fulfilment of their ministry, they continually depend on the free grace of God.

(c) At such a time as the union of Churches, it is particularly appropriate to seek anew God's blessing not only on the whole Church, but also on each minister and to have each minister receive his commission under the authority of the united Church. In such an act, they will look to God who alone can bestow on each what he may need for the fulfilment of his ministry in the days ahead.

On the basis of these common convictions and respect for conscience it is proposed that, in the service of Union, there should be an act of unification of the ministry in which by prayer with the laying on of hands, God's grace is sought for the wider and more effectual fulfilment of each ministry. This is not a preliminary to union, but takes place in the act of Union, indeed as the first act of the United Church. All ministers alike will share in the act, with no discrimination according to the previous form of their ordination. It is therefore hoped both that the act will meet the difficulty which made it necessary, and also that all alike will find it reverent, meaningful and fitting."

Meet The Church of the Brethren

Rev. A. Holderreed

THE Church of the Brethren has been participating in the Negotiations looking toward union for the past few years. Two questions have been raised about the Brethren: (1) what convictions have brought the Brethren to be interested in Church Union, and (2) what contributions do the Brethren think they will bring to the great united Church? There is a real sense in which the paper should have been prepared by a member of another communion, who, having studied the Brethren, could have presented an objective glimpse or evaluation. However the effort will be made to state simply the Brethren point of view as one brother sees it. The Brethren do not feel their contributions as exclusively and peculiarly their own.

People of the Book.

One of our church historians, Floyd E. Mallott, has stated that "The Brethren are truly characterized as a company of people who seek to exemplify the type of life expounded in the Sermon on the Mount". The Brethren, having roots in the ideas of St Bernard, St. Francis and Peter Waldo, may well be called "Biblical Pietistic mystics". They have always been people of the Book, and have urged all to "Search the Scriptures". The Brethren, although they emerged in the

period when Separatists added confusion to the already divided and incredibly low standard of church and Christian life in western Europe, were not Separatists. They wanted no spiritual anarchy. Since they were not welcomed in the established churches, but persecuted and driven out, they of necessity formed a church which set out to imitate primitive Christianity. At this juncture the first-fruits of modern historical methods were made available to them in the writings of an independent historian, Gottfried Arnold.

This confirmed what they read in the New Testament, namely, that the practices of the surrounding state churches were not in the primitive pattern. Hence the Brethren adopted the New Testament baptism of believers, the washing of feet and the lovefeast before the Communion, the anointing with oil for the sick, the Holy Kiss of Peace, the three levels of church leadership as deacons, ministers and elders. These largely describe the Brethren pattern carried out today, both in America and in the churches established as a result of evangelistic activity.

Because of the reactions to years of persecution, both in continental Europe and in Revolutionary America, the Brethren tended to remain a tightly knit rural German Church. The great sweep of modern education and opportunity caught up the Brethren

after the Civil War in America, and they became more aware of the world. They discovered the Great Commission of the Gospels and set out on Mission. Mission work, and labouring along with other devout Christians, helped to broaden the Brethren views.

In places where the Brethren live, they have been leaders in the development of "ministerial associations" and have taken part in "State Councils", and in National Councils. They have adhered to comity arrangements with other Christian bodies. This is to say that the Brethren have believed in co-operation and in the Church. Here in India they still do. They believe that Christians, of good and sincere faith, ought to be able to work together in witnessing and making visible the fruits of the Spirit to a world that needs, not only words of creed and faith, but consistent deeds of love and mercy.

The New Testament our Guide

The Brethren would point the Church again to the *New Testament*. They have no particular doctrine or theory of inspiration but hold to the New Testament because it testifies of Jesus Christ and primitive Christianity. This has led the Brethren to question some of the traditions of the churches surrounding them, and particularly the many accretions and ideas of mechanical sacerdotalism. The devout adoption of New Testament Christianity has led to great emphasis on ethical living and humanitarian conduct. In Colonial America it was recognized that "A Brethren's word was as good as his bond". Latter day applications of their understanding of New Testament living has sent Brethren volunteers to many trouble spots of the world to minister to human needs, without regard to creed, race or political hue.

In Europe and America, their refugee homeland, the Brethren saw the strife that comes out of a heightened use and emphasis on creedal statements and creeds. So the Brethren have never set about composing and adopting a creed. They have often said simply, "The New Testament is our creed", or "The New Testament is our guide". Ben Franklin queried one of the Brethren as to his creed, so that he could compare it with others. The brother replied, in effect, that they had written down no creed. They read the Scriptures and trusted that God would give them new light on His Word.

Renunciation of Force

The Brethren would point to the *non-violence* of Jesus and primitive Christianity, and the need for abandonment of the method of war. They believe it to be contrary to the love expressed in Christ, and cannot believe that followers of the Prince of Peace should participate in war. Frequently they are called "conscientious objectors to war", or "pacifists". In both Europe and America up to the present time Brethren have paid for this conviction in terms of persecution and frequent imprisonment, and also in terms of alternative programmes of service to nation and humanity which they have supported out of their own pockets and labours. The Brethren have also been opposed to the use of force in religion. They suffered under the established churches in the 17th century settlements of the strife. A meaningful Christian life is based on a vital and personal relation to Jesus Christ and that cannot be legislated or forced.

The Brethren would lift up *Fellowship* as most important in the life of the Church. This brotherliness has been real and precious to them at all periods. When neighbours were in need, there was the fellowship of work in seeing that affairs were taken care of and provisions made for the family. There was the fellowship of study of the Scriptures. There was the fellowship of worship in the plain homes and school buildings. There was intense fellowship as they prepared for the biannual Love Feast, where they had days of heart-searching preaching, followed by the washing of feet, the great common meal, and finally the Breaking of Bread together and the shared Cup. The Brethren have always permitted private interpretations of teachings and doctrines, but Fellowship with one's brethren has been an important test of Christian life. Hence before the Love Feast, the deacons visited every member and enquired, "Dear Brother, are you in love and fellowship with the Brethren?". The Brethren have welcomed others into this shared life of brothers under Christ.

Christ in all Life

The Brethren, even in these modern times, point to the *Simple Life* as the ideal. They found the idea in the New Testament. Their non-conformist lives showed this simplicity of dress, adornment and habits of life. They

felt that Christians had a stewardship to discharge. They believed luxury, extravagance, and personal adornment lead to pride and coldness of spiritual life. They have never been able to forget the suffering and need of the world nor the plain teaching of the New Testament.

The Brethren join some other groups in laying great emphasis on the *Priesthood of Believers*. This is shown in their old custom of not having the pulpit elevated above the place of the members. This was shown in the use of the free-ministry, up to the present time, though most of our churches have copied from their neighbours now! It was the faithful congregation that, through prayer and the guidance of the Holy Spirit, laid the call upon worthy men for the ministry. The elders were indeed leaders, but they neither expected nor were given reverence or undue deference. Elders had weight in the conduct

of the life of the church, but they were not autocratic, and they served as moderator only on seasonal election. Pastors, elders and laity alike used and were greeted with the title of "brother". It was the duty and privilege of all members to study the Scriptures, to pray, to serve, and, when opportunity afforded, to teach and speak the Word.

The Brethren have emphasized that Christ is for all of life, and that all of life is to be brought into harmony with Christ. In India this has brought the Brethren into the broad spectrum of activities to endeavour to serve or minister to all areas of life so familiar to most of our mission programmes around the world. The rural emphasis has been more prominent, because the rural Brethren sense that Christians independently rooted on the soil and exercising their stewardship, make for strong Christian communities and churches.

HOLY BAPTISM

"Conscience Cases"

A Proposal by the Rev. F. Wyld*

I SHOULD like to put before the ACC a suggestion for the solution of the problem presented by what may be described as "Conscience cases" over the administration of Holy Baptism.

1. There are cases where persons brought up in the tradition of Baptism in Infancy with sponsors and only affusion by water, meet in life those brought up in the tradition of Believer's Baptism by immersion, and come to feel their own infant baptism was and is defective.

2. There are also cases where a person brought up in the one tradition is married to a partner brought up in the other. This both at the time of the ceremony, and in after life, may constitute a strain in relationship.

3. There are also some cases where persons brought up in the infant baptism tradition feel it is not after the Gospel pattern, yet have not actually felt it necessary to leave the Church of their forefathers.

4. It is not impossible to conceive of a

case where for reasons of climate, old age or health it may be in-advisable to practice immersion, whereas in later life the reasons may be removed. In such a case where the candidate has a conscience over the latter, the above practice may serve to solve the problem.

How can we then meet these cases of conscience? In a United Church there must be "One Lord; One Faith; One Baptism" therefore must it always be contrary to the constitution to have a Second Baptism.

The suggestion then is this:—

By an extension, not a repetition, of the original Baptism.

The formula that might be used can be somewhat as follows:—

"N. or M. baptised into the One Family of the Church of Jesus Christ, we now immerse thee into the Waters of Salvation.

In the Name....."

Spiritual experiences and acts may be rightly regarded as 'timeless'. Therefore this will be looked on, not as a second or a re-baptising, but as an extension or completion of the original act.

*For the Church Union Committee of the Assam Christian Council Shillong, Assam.

Episcopalian and Presbyterian Orders

Reply to an Anglican View on Inter-Communion

Rev. David Lyon

I

DURING these years while negotiations have been going on in committee, the Churches themselves have been drawing closer together. Through joint action in the Gospel, worship in united services and through interchange of pulpits, we have come to appreciate more fully the unity which God has given us in Christ, and to feel more deeply how intolerable is our separation. There has come too a change in how we think about the Church. Whereas before a Presbyterian or an Anglican might have thought in terms of his own tradition or of what differentiates that tradition from another, this is no longer so. We have been led, to look beyond the pattern fixed in our own Churches to the Church as a whole—to the Church which is one, holy, catholic and apostolic. We have been drawn to seek again in our thinking the basic Biblical perspective, and in the process to see and to confess in contrition the fragmented nature of our separated Churches. Certainly the Holy Spirit has been at work among us in judgement and mercy. So different from the past, it would seem strange now for any one of the Churches to defend its own present position as requiring no change, and stranger still for any of us to deny another Church to be as truly the Church as our own. None of us, as the Plan of Union makes plain, desires to claim any such superiority for his own tradition. We have acknowledged each other's ministries as ministries of Christ in his Word and Sacraments and have acknowledged too, that owing to our divisions, all our ministries are limited in scope, not having the seal of the whole Church.* The negotiations that have been going on have been recognized from the first as negotiations between Church bodies of equal status.

This is all very obvious. It has been necessary however to state the obvious, because we still find ourselves thinking about the Church in the old restricted ways. Old

polemics still lead us to misunderstand other Churches, prevent us from looking afresh at our own traditions, and from taking as seriously as we should the Biblical revelation. Bishop Blair's article in the last number of *Church News and Views*, which must have been disturbing to many readers, would seem to fall into these errors. In fact to read his article, is almost to step into another world. Where is the judgement we have experienced these last days upon our inadequacy, in separation, to fulfil God's mission—to be truly apostolic? Where too is the urgent call to renewal that we have heard from God? The past thirty years of negotiation and of growth together might never have been. Even the system of comity where we have entrusted the souls of men without fear to the care of other denominations (Anglicans to Presbyterians, Presbyterians to Anglicans), might not exist. We are back again to thinking about the Church within the circle of our own. In fairness to Bishop Blair, it has to be said that he would claim not to be arguing against the position of other Churches, his brief being only to describe what the Anglican Church believes. What his claim to be speaking merely domestically amounts to, however, it is hard to see, since he asserts quite unambiguously that succession by line of bishops is necessary for the maintenance of true orders and Sacraments within the Church, and that the Sacrament of Holy Communion, therefore celebrated by Churches other than those at present in communion with the Anglican Church, is radically imperfect. When he goes on to state that inter-communion is at present impossible we can see clearly that this is the logical position for him to take. The only possible conclusion that is left for us to draw from what he says is that in his view the other Churches are not properly Churches at all; from which it follows that the union he contemplates is not so much union as absorption—the other Churches being absorbed into the Church. We need hardly remind ourselves that this is neither the conclusion we have to draw from the position

* Plan of Union, p. 55

of the CIPBC as a whole, not from the position taken in negotiations leading to the Plan of Union. We can only hope that Bishop Blair does not hold his view as rigidly as his words would suggest.

II

Bishop Blair speaks at some length of what he calls the Anglican view of the Eucharist and the ministry. In summing up he draws attention to what he considers most important in this position. These considerations are:

"the two ideas of a sacrament as a pledge of the reception of grace apart from any feelings or emotions that one may have experienced or failed to experience, and of the minister as not only the chosen representative of the people before God, but also God's chosen representative to the people, chosen by the people and offered to God and accepted and empowered by Him."

He goes on to say that "these two ideas seem to us to be a contribution of very great value that the Anglican Church can bring into the new united Church." To this we can say, "Fair enough"; only adding that these ideas would seem neither to be peculiarly Anglican, nor to depend on the historic succession of diocesan bishops. These ideas are not at all different from what Presbyterians at least would accept as their own. We are quite certain that the efficacy of the Sacrament does not depend upon our feelings; and we also hold most firmly to the fact that the ordained minister is not merely chosen from among the people, but called and empowered by God.

There is no need in this article to go into the nature of the Sacraments or of ordination; the main point at issue is neither of these things in themselves, but the view which Bishop Blair assumes but does not argue, that diocesan bishops are the only agents accredited by God with power to ordain. The issue is what is normally called apostolic succession.

We shall try to do two things: we shall try first of all, to discover just how firm the ground is for asserting that apostolic succession through line of diocesan bishops is essential to the Church, and second, in view of the comparison Bishop Blair makes between the two traditions, to examine the relationship between the orders of the

Churches of England and Scotland at the Reformation and after. This last is important because of the evidence it yields of the historical Anglican position, different in several respects from that held by Bishop Blair.*

We must begin with the Biblical evidence. It would be well to recall here at the outset that the Anglican Church, like the other Churches looks to Scripture as the source of doctrine. The Encyclical Letter from the Lambeth Conference, 1958, includes these words: "One of the distinguishing marks of our Anglican Communion is the supreme importance which is attached to the authority of the Bible in the formulation of doctrine."† This being so we should expect to find authority in Scripture for a doctrine as important as this. In fact the Bible would appear to be silent about it.

Of course the Bible is far from silent about apostolicity. Indeed, behind this word, which comes from the word meaning to send, lies the entire story of God's activity in history for the salvation of man—his calling and sending, first of Abraham, then of Moses, then of the People as a whole, and finally, and in fulfilment, the sending of Christ. When we speak of apostolicity, then, against the background of the Old Testament and in the light of the New, we are speaking of God's great purpose of gathering all things to himself in Christ His Son. Apostolicity, and the apostolate, refer fundamentally to the mission of Christ, through whom God's reconciling work is done, to him who is the "Apostle and High Priest of our confession."

When we speak of the apostolicity of the Church, what we ought primarily to have in mind are two things: first, the foundation of the Church, which in a derived sense consists of the apostles, through whose witness alone we know Christ, and which ultimately is Christ himself; and second, the end for which the Church was founded, namely its mission in Christ, to the "end of the world and the end of the age." As it is, the Church has traditionally, in the attention it has paid to the first of these, given a quite disproportionate

* The section on the ministries of the two traditions is dependent largely on several articles which have appeared in recent years in the *Scottish Journal of Theology*. Generally we shall not acknowledge these sources in detail, but merely refer to relevant articles as a whole.

† The Lambeth Conference, 1958, I: 18

onate place to ministries and orders, and that within an organization conceived of in a static sense which is foreign to Scripture.

Coming to look at ministries and orders, the first thing we notice is how much wider and more varied are the ministries in the New Testament than those we deal with ordinarily in our discussions. It is good that we in all our traditions should remind ourselves of this fact. As the Church moved beyond Jerusalem, taking the Good News of the Kingdom across the world of the time, there grew up within it a multitude and variety of ministries. Not only were there bishops or presbyters and deacons, but prophets, evangelists, teachers, healers, pastors. Among these ministries too there would seem to be no sign of any hierarchy of offices. The only suggestion we have of degrees of higher and lower, is that special importance was given to the ministry of the Word — see Acts 6: 1ff.

The exact position of the apostles in the life of the Church is far from clear. They undoubtedly held a place of pre-eminence in the Church. The evidence, however, does not enable us to go beyond this and to say, as some would, that they transmitted authority and power to others called within the Church, that they in fact were the only accredited agents of God", and that ministries were dependent upon them. We are in no position to say that it was they, or they alone, who ordained the presbyters or bishops, or ordained those who ordained them. The authority they held would seem to have been of a personal kind, and that quite untransmissible. It came from their close fellowship with Jesus in the time of his flesh, a privilege they could share with no one else. Others besides the twelve (or rather the eleven) had been sent out by Him as His representatives and with His authority, and had been also witnesses of His resurrection. The final authority and commission given by our Lord in His resurrection appearance to the disciples alone, and the command given to them at the institution of the Lord's Supper would seem to have been given to them as forerunners of the Church so soon to come to birth.

The fellowship of the Church was a continuance at another level of the fellowship formed in the person of the disciples round Jesus. When Jesus gathered the disciples He

was forming in nucleus the new People of God. He was forming round Himself as the Messiah, the Messianic community, which pointed beyond itself to what was to be. The place of the apostles in the Church, which came into being in continuance of the earlier community and which embodied within itself the authority and power formerly given to them, was to proclaim what God had done in Christ and what His purpose was; and to witness to Him, now risen and ascended, in whom the Church within His Spirit had its being. There is no evidence that the apostles held hierarchical office or that apostolic authority was transmitted by them. Neither is there any evidence in Scripture for succession through a line of bishops.

Whatever evidence there may be for Bishop Blair's view of succession, it certainly cannot be maintained by clear authority of Scripture. Moreover, whatever view of succession we may hold, the fact of our failure to maintain as we should the missionary impetus of the Church, which is implicit in true apostolicity, is sufficient to remove any complacency about the Churches, or any view that one of them is more obedient than another.

It is outside the New Testament record, in the post-apostolic age, that evidence for succession through a line of bishops first appears. By this time, about the middle of the second century, there were three offices in the Church; bishops, presbyters and deacons, the first claiming to possess apostolic authority. We have to be clear however, about what the evidence says and what it does not. What it says, is that from about 150 A.D., that is to say after a long period following the death of the apostles, about which we know nothing, there were bishops in the Church occupying diocesan chairs, through whom apostolic succession was ordinarily claimed to be transmitted. What it does not say is that there was unbroken succession between these bishops and the apostles. "The evidence is both too scanty and too conflicting" Bishop Noel Hall puts it, "to afford anything approaching rigorous proof that the episcopal line was actually perpetuated by unbroken transmission."* We have to notice too, as Bishop Hall also points out, that in the period immediately after 150, about which we do have evidence, there is no certainty that authority was always

*Hall, *SJT* Vol. II, p. 117.

transmitted by this method. Indeed there is evidence that it was not. Up to Nicaea in fact, bishops were in some places consecrated by presbyters.*

Even in the later period there is evidence that though ordination was normally by bishops, at certain times presbyters were permitted to carry out this office. This happened for example both under Pope Boniface IX and Pope Innocent VIII.† There are instances also of abbots who were not bishops being permitted to ordain.

III

We come now to the period of the reformation, and to a discussion of Anglican and Presbyterian orders. Before, however, we look at how these two traditions developed, we must turn for a moment to the Roman Catholic Church, which is the background common to them both and indeed to all the negotiating Churches. In the Roman Church we have to note that although there were three *offices* in the Church, there were only two *orders*. The presbyter and bishop both belonged to the same order, merely having different functions. By common opinion of the Schoolmen, an opinion shared by Aquinas, the presbyterate was recognized as being the essential order of the Church, the bishop being a presbyter who had been given episcopal office. This identification of presbyter and bishop is of course what we find in Scripture. In the New Testament the terms, *episcopos* and *presbyteros* are interchangeable — see Acts 20 : 17-28 and Titus 1 : 5-9.

The unity of the order, presbyter-bishop, was carried over at the reformation both by the Church of England and the Churches of the continental reformation. As we shall see in a moment the Church of England later made certain alterations in this order, but first let us see what happened within the Church of Scotland. The Presbyterians did not, as Bishop Blair unhappily fails to mention, abolish episcopal ministry — this was not one of the things with which they did away. What they abolished in Scotland was the diocesan structure (so far as it existed) and the office of bishop as at that time constituted. In place of a pattern which had well nigh disintegrated they built up the

parish. The parish was put in the place of the diocese and the old three-fold scheme of offices, bishops, presbyters and deacons, was retained at this level. The minister of the Word and Sacraments (the presbyter) exercised the office of bishop within the order presbyter-bishop, the elders the office of presbyter within the same order, and the members of the deacon's court the office of deacon within the order of the diaconate. Then as now the Presbyterian Church was episcopal, the *episcopate* being exercised by the presbyter-bishop with his co-presbyters in the presbytery. In all this the nomenclature of the Presbyterian Churches is a source of misunderstanding to many, and we can see signs of this misunderstanding in Bishop Blair's article. It leads many to suppose that there is no other ministerial office in Presbyterianism than the presbyter (the priest in Anglicanism), and since the priest cannot ordain it is supposed that there can be no ordination properly so-called in Presbyterianism. What is forgotten is that the equation that should be made is not between minister and priest, but between parish minister and diocesan bishop.*

In England we find that the Church at the reformation continued the western Roman practice of the two orders as in Scotland. In the 1550 ordinal it is quite plain that the presbyterate was considered the essential order in the Christian ministry and Scriptural identification of presbyter and bishop was basically maintained. The lections also in the ordinal referring to presbyters and bishops are almost identical. Two important documents of the Anglican reformation, one of the 1536 subscribed by two archbishops and nineteen bishops, and another of like authority of 1543 are found to substantiate this position. At this stage, and for a hundred years following, "no importance seemed to be placed by the majority of Anglicans to a tactual succession in the ministry by means of episcopal ordination",† and we find Presbyterian orders on the continent being recognized and many in Presbyterian orders being admitted to livings in the Church of England.

A change of a serious kind in the orders of the Church of England is revealed in the

*See further for this section — Walker, *SJT Vol. 8* p 238 ff; Greenslade, *SJT Vol. 9*, p 163; Barkley, *SJT Vol. 9*, p 135ff and *SJT Vol. 11*, p 147.

†Bromiley, *SJT Vol. 7*, p. 76.

*Barkley, *SJT Vol. 11*, p. 148.

†Barkley, *SJT Vol. 9*, p. 135.

rdinal of 1661. In this year, in the face of great ecclesiastical and political upheaval, and in order to make a firm distinction between Anglican and Presbyterian orders, the power which had formerly resided in the order of presbyter-bishop was transferred to the bishop alone. The power of the presbyter was diminished and this office became in fact a separate order subordinate to the episcopal. From now on the presbyter assumed the essentially subordinate position which the priest now holds. In the preface to the ordinal of this year episcopal ordination was specifically mentioned for the first time, while the lectionaries referring to bishop and presbyter were completely altered—the Scriptural references formerly applied to both being now applied only to the bishop. Moreover for the first time in the title and presentation bishops were said to be “ordained” and “consecrated”; and a new question was added at the “examination” of bishops referring to their faithfulness in the laying on of hands and ordaining. What we have here are three orders taking the place of the established two, a departure being made both from traditional practice and from the Scriptural identification of presbyter and bishop.

This change has important implications for the relation between Presbyterian and Anglican orders. There is no question now, with the withdrawal of the power of the presbyterate from the priest and the relegating of him to a subordinate position in an essential way, that it is quite improper to equate Anglican priest, rather than Anglican bishop, with Presbyterian minister. It is not the case at this point of Presbyterians “getting rid of all this” but the other way round. The minister of Word and Sacraments in the full sense belongs to the order presbyter-bishop, to which now the priest does not belong. Ecumenical understanding would be furthered if this were once and for all cognized.

Before bringing this section to a close it might be worth while speaking of what happened a little earlier. It has interesting parallels with the CSI and is relevant to us to-day. Bishop Blair mentions that non-episcopally ordained ministers (in the Anglican sense) were refused admission to the Church of England under William. What he fails to mention is what happened some years before when James VI reintroduced episcopal bishops into Scotland. To achieve

his purpose James VI took three Presbyterian ministers from Scotland to England and had them consecrated there by the hierarchy (their ministry was allowed to stand), and then sent them back to Scotland where they in turn consecrated others of their Presbyterian brethren as diocesans. The hybrid Church which came into existence consisted (not counting the bishops) entirely in its ministry of Presbyterian ministers. The interesting thing is that the Presbyterian ministry was recognized (there was neither reordination nor additional ordination), and there was inter-communion between this Church and the Church of England.*

The changes that took place in 1661, to be understood within a particular historical situation, drove a wedge between Presbyterianism and Anglicanism, but even then did not make such a break as Bishop Blair would suggest exists at present. Coming to our situation in India to-day, it seems curious that any one of us should want to make that division more complete. It seems quite clear from what we have seen above that Bishop Blair is making claims for a distinction between orders, and for an exclusiveness in Anglicanism, which it itself does not make historically.

IV

Coming back once more to the doctrine of succession through line of bishops, it would seem possible to draw the following conclusions.

(1) Scripture is silent about it, yet we are being asked to regard it as essential.

(2) There is no evidence that the line of succession through diocesan bishops has continued without break from the apostles to the present day (the evidence is all the other way), and yet unbroken succession would seem to be necessary to this position.

(3) The Church of England at the crucial period of the reformation claimed neither in theory nor practice that this doctrine was essential.

(4) The Church of England at that time and for long after recognized the orders of Churches considered to be non-episcopal.

* For further details of the 16th-17th century period See Walker in *SJT* as already cited and Barkley, *SJT Vol. II*, p. 134.

(5) There is no evidence one way or another that such a position guarantees the efficacy of the Sacraments. It is worth noting again that everything Bishop Blair says about the Sacraments and about ordination, omitting reference to diocesan bishops, could very well have been said by a Presbyterian. The Sacraments and ordination are, we would say, as he describes them.

(6) There is no evidence that this position guarantees orthodoxy of doctrine. In fact we can say with certainty that it does not. Bishops in the so-called succession have been on both sides in all the great controversies of the Church, many being involved in heresy and their successors with them.

The Scriptural and historical evidence, without making mention of theological considerations, would hardly seem to sustain the position Bishop Blair holds. (This in no way implies that we should not consider that diocesan bishops, with their traditional place in the Church, have not played an important part in the maintenance of succession; but this is different from claiming that they have been essential.) If the members of the Churches in negotiation with the CIPBC are not to entertain deep suspicions that the union proposed is not a true union but absorption, then inter-communion ought to take place immediately. Even where there is no such suspicion, it is hard indeed to understand why the CIPBC continues to keep apart from the one Table of the Lord. Inter-communion would do much to make easier the step that lies before us, and would be entirely consistent with the place (acknowledged by us all) that the negotiating Churches, all of them, have with in the one catholic Church.

It only remains for us to quote some words of the Very Rev. W. R. Mathews, Dean of St. Pauls, which puts the issue raised by Bishop Blair clearly and concisely. In a sermon preached a year ago, with the Anglican

Presbyterian conversations in Britain in view, he says:

"1. We may hold that episcopacy, as we have it in the Anglican Church, is of the essence of the Church, and it would follow from that that where there is no bishop there is no Church. From that again it would follow that Presbyterians are not really part of the universal Church of Christ and their ministry is not a ministry of the catholic Church nor are their sacraments truly sacraments of the Church. If that is the view that we take, then I ask, *What are we talking about?* The only consistent policy could be to try and convert Presbyterians to our way of thinking.

2. A great many of us, I am sure, do not feel able to accept this rigid view of the nature of the Church. When we are confronted by what appears to be the manifest gifts of the Spirit to the Church of Scotland, we feel it is impossible to deny that it is a part of the catholic Church, and we feel compelled to agree that its sacraments are real sacraments and its Holy Communion is really a communion of the body and blood of Christ, its ministry a real ministry of Christ. This is again a logical and comprehensive view. If it is our view, then I ask, *What are we waiting for?* Why cannot we have inter-communion now and express in action our real fellowship with one another by meeting at the Table of the Lord?"

Put the CIPBC in place of the Church of England in the above, and the UCNI or any of the other negotiating Churches in place of the Church of Scotland, and that is the situation that faces us to-day.

With no reason in the Gospel to prevent inter-communion now, why indeed do we wait?

Necessity of the Ministry :

For neither are the light and heat of the sun, nor meat and drink, so necessary to sustain and cherish the present life as is the apostolical and pastoral office to preserve a Church in the earth.

John Calvin : *Institutes* (IV. iii. 2)

Baptist Decision in Pakistan

WE are grateful to the Rev. Gordon Soddy, of the Baptist Missionary Society in East Pakistan for a copy of the Resolutions of the Assembly of the Baptist Union of Pakistan which we print below. It will be noted that these Resolutions embody a definite decision not to proceed with the Plan of Church Union for North India/Pakistan, but open up certain alternative proposals. This decision is quite independent of the decision, still awaited, of the Council of Baptist Churches in North India.

In a letter which Mr. Soddy has written to the Editor, he emphasises the fact that the particular situation in which the Baptist Union of Pakistan finds itself must be kept in mind. Separated politically from the churches in West Bengal and separated geographically from the churches in West Pakistan, the churches of this union are bound to give a good deal of consideration to their relations with their actual neighbours within East Pakistan itself. In addition, Mr. Soddy writes as follows:

"The rejection was certainly not a rejection of the idea of Union,—in fact it was the reverse! It was because we felt so strongly that this particular Union as far as East Pakistan is concerned at present would not be a Union at all but just the creation of yet one more "denomination" that made many of us very hesitant about it all along. We are actually enjoying at present a far higher measure of co-operation and united action in East Pakistan now than is the case in many other countries through the Christian Council, but most of the bodies in that Council are not interested in this Union Scheme at all. If we stayed in the Union Scheme we should have united (presumably) with the Anglicans and with two small Presbyterian bodies, but we should have left outside the Union quite a large portion of the present Christian Council. So for geographical and purely local reasons we felt that we should in effect be putting the lock of Union back by continuing in this present Scheme, and that we are more likely to attain an effective Union on a Federal basis within the province than by attempting to present anything more organic. In putting

the stress on the purely local reasons I am not trying to undervalue the theological reasons also given. There are those among us who feel these extremely strongly, and who claim most vehemently the "freedom of conscience" mentioned in the first paragraph (A). This is a live issue among us, and quite properly took first place in the reasons we gave. But how far that would have been dominant by itself I do not quite know. Certainly it was the fact that after all we were not going to get very much advantage out of the scheme as at present formulated, that decided many of us that we should do better to withdraw, and that we had real hopes of getting to Union on a provincial basis by another route.....we naturally are thinking in terms rather of something which affects only East Pakistan, and which will give us union within those bounds. And I feel that we are on the way to getting it, and that to have remained within the wider Scheme would have been most detrimental to us all."

Baptist Union of Pakistan

The following resolutions were passed by the Assembly.

Resolved:—

That this Assembly of the Baptist Union of Pakistan, being fully representative of the affiliated district Church Unions feels unable to commit its member unions and Churches to participation in the proposed Church of North India/Pakistan, on the basis of the "Plan of Church Union" as presented to the negotiating Churches for their decisions. We place on record the following reasons which lead us to decide against participation:—

(a) We believe that the "Plan of Church Union" does not make provision for freedom of conscience in regard to Believer's Baptism for those who were christened as infants but, who on reaching years of discretion, desire Believer's Baptism. We note that the Negotiating Committee has reconstituted its sub-committee on matters connected with baptism but it seems evident that this committee is not intended to suggest material changes in the Plan,—mere clarification, in our opinion,

being unable to remove the main difficulties of our churches with regard to this feature of the Plan.

(b) We further believe that in many denominations including our own, the meaning of baptism is being earnestly reconsidered, and that prematurely to foreclose the issue (as acceptance of this Plan would tend to do) would be to deprive ourselves and other Christian churches of the opportunity of receiving fresh light and guidance from the Holy Spirit.

(c) We find further difficulty in accepting the Plan specially in the matter of the unification of the ministry, and the proposed system of Church government. We feel that the possibility of conflicting interpretations of the wording of the Plan in many places would lead to tensions in the United Church destructive from the very beginning of its unity.

(d) We also feel that in the present Church situation in East Pakistan, Union according to the proposed Plan affects such a small proportion of the Church bodies working within the province, that the result of such a Union would be simply the creation of yet another denomination, and that it is possible for us to attain the more effective union we desire along other paths.

Future of "Church Union" in East Pakistan

In view of the overwhelming opinion in the BUP Churches against the present Plan of Church Union, the Assembly considered in what ways our Churches should seek closer affinity with their sister Churches of other denominations in this province.

Resolved:—

(a) That the Council will be instructed to reconstitute the Church Union Sub-Committee for approaching all the constituent Churches of the EPCC with the purpose of calling a conference in the near future to discuss the possibility of a Federal Union of Churches in East Pakistan which, while maintaining individual identity and freedom in matters of administration and doctrine, will reach agreement on at least the following matters:—

(i) Inter-communion. (ii) Mutual transfer of members, (iii) Mutual recognition of ministeries, and then consider any other respect in which closer co-operation could be achieved.

(b) That this reconstituted Sub-Committee continue at present under the Convenership of Rev. J. O. Wilde, with four members including the BUP Secretary and the BMS Field Secretary.

The Church: A Baptist Interpretation

My thoughts go immediately to a passage in John's first epistle:

"That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ.If we walk in the light as he is in the light we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin".

There is our magnet, operative at all points. For it is the fellowship of the individual soul with Christ that makes a Christian. It is the fellowship of soul with soul in Christ that makes a church. It is the fellowship of church with church in Christ that makes a union or convention. It is the fellowship of unions and conventions in Christ that makes the Baptist Word Alliance. And it is the atoning sacrifice of the Redeemer which is the ground of our confidence and hope.

Gibber Laws: in *Warchman-Examiner*, Nov. 3, 1955.

To Subscribers in the U.S.A.

Miss G. S. Nyce, 219 Mather Rd., Jenkintown, Pa. has kindly agreed to accept subscriptions in U. S. A. and forward them to India. This will be a help to subscribers and to the Office here and we appreciate Miss Nyce's help. (*Business Manager*).

Book Reviews

Unity: Hope and Experience, by Michael Hollis; Baptist Mission Press, 41 Lower Circular Road, Calcutta 27, pp; .75 nP.

In this book, the Carey lecture for 1960, Bishop Hollis tells the story of the Church of South India. He does so with deep understanding, as we would expect, and with careful and sincere clarity. As he recounts the main theological issues that Church has faced, we find ourselves comparing notes from our position in the north. Certain basic factors governing reunion in general may be discerned in the history of the CSI. These he brings into sharp focus, and it is this above all which makes his book so valuable. Not that Bishop Hollis in any way suggests that the CSI is a blue-print to be copied, or that the way it has gone is the way for all. That is not his view. In every scheme of reunion the Churches must follow the guidance of the Holy Spirit within their own situations.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first the author describes the way reunion came in South India. He tells how the Churches were faced with tremendous opportunities in the Gospel to which in separation they were unable to make response. 'The voice' as he says, 'was not between doing things denominationally or doing them through union but between doing them unitedly or not doing them at all.' The times challenged to obedience. The Churches stood under judgement. This union which the Churches were called of God to manifest was recognized as being a unity already given in Christ. It was a unity which the Churches could refuse to accept only at their peril. Bishop Hollis has a word here to say to the Churches in the West. They are so accustomed, he contends, to the condition of separation that they are no longer 'horrified, as the Apostle Paul was horrified at the spectacle of divisions among those for whom Christ was crucified.' They have in general lost the eschatological dimension. They can speak of possible advances to union in terms of thirty or forty years, forgetful that there may not be another thirty or forty years, and that God makes present demands which can-

not be postponed. In the formation of the new Church of South India the realization of the crucial urgency of reunion was one of the basic factors. The reconciliation which Christ had made on the cross had to be manifested in every place where the Church was planted, and in these times. This realization, as Bishop Hollis points out, involved the recognition that the primary need was for union at the local level. The immediate call was to love the Christian brother in another Church in one's own village or town whom one has seen, rather than the brother of one's own denomination in another continent whom one has not seen. Herein was the real challenge to unity. A further fundamental factor was the acceptance from the start that negotiations were between Church bodies of equal status. The judgement of God was upon all the Churches in their separation. There was no question of any one of them claiming spiritual superiority. The given unity lay beyond all the separated Churches. All had fallen short.

In the second part Bishop Hollis speaks of the Church of South India's growing together into unity. He quotes the conversations with the Lutherans as revealing how much the CSI has achieved a common mind. 'I cannot remember' he says, 'a single instance in which the CSI delegation have been unable to speak with one voice on any essential matter.' This unity of mind does not mean uniformity. There is, he says, a wonderful diversity within the Church. As we have grown to know and trust one another more and to appreciate better the gifts which God gave to our parent Churches in their separation, we have discovered that God is not merely patient of diversity but loves it.' He goes on to describe the CSI as a growing Church and a Church on the move, one which is ready to respond to any change that God demands and to go where he leads. Already in its relations with other Churches it faces the possibility of new alterations of structure. Any union which may come will not be a union of absorption, but one involving real change within the life of the uniting Churches, as in the union of the CSI itself. The Church affirms that it is a pilgrim people.

Bishop Hollis says that he was once asked how the Church of South India is settling down. The answer was: 'Pray God, not at all and never.'

These are just some of the points Bishop Hollis makes. Many others of great importance might also have been mentioned. He deals for instance with the problem of the ministry, and in a useful section makes criticism of the 'pastorate system'. A random selection does scant justice to this book. It deserves thoughtful study and one hopes it will have wide circulation not only in this country but abroad.

D.H.S.L.

Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church: (*An Interim Statement: SPCK and Epworth Press, London, 3/6d.*)

The ten yearly Reports of Lambeth Conferences provide, over a long period of time, impressive evidence of the steadfastness with which the Anglican Churches have been seeking the visible unity of the Church. There have been conversations with a remarkable variety of ecclesiastical bodies, including the Moravian Brethren and the Greek Orthodox Church, and, although results so far achieved are not spectacular, the 1958 Report shows the effort to continue unabated.

When, as in the case of the Church of England and the Methodist Church, the conversations are with a body which was actually separated from the Church of England itself in comparatively modern times, it is natural that they should be in terms of a "reunion", there is a considerable urge for a return to the fellowship of the parent body, and one must hope that the way to such reunion would not prove too difficult.

This "Interim Report" provides us with much valuable background material, particularly in Chapter 3 which is the work of two distinguished scholars (Drs. Norman Sykes and Gordon Rupp) one an Anglican and one a Methodist. The ability to look with this degree of objectivity at the history of the past provides good hope for progress towards greater understanding in the future.

One must confess to a sense of inevitableness when, in Chapter 4, the Anglican members, having reminded readers that one of the functions of the episcopate should be to manifest unity add, "and no other form is likely to become the means of restoring the visible unity". No evidence is offered to support this familiar claim. At the same time, one notes with appreciation that on the next page it is conceded at least that "legitimate succession" is "of little value if taken apart from the continuity of Scripture, the rule of faith and the Sacraments", and in the following Chapter, the Methodists on their part point to other "characteristics" which are not mentioned in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, but which certainly have have a place in the fulness of the life of the Church.

When we reach Chapter 6, however, we learn with disappointment that the conversations are apparently mainly concerned with the surely subsidiary question of "Whether episcopacy could be taken into the Methodist Church". Without seriously raising the question of whether this question is relevant or important, the Report proceeds to contemplate the possibility of some "unification of ministries" (possibly on the North India model!) which would result in two separate and distinct churches apparently existing side by side in full communion with each other. Does not this picture contain all the defects that have been sensed in the proposal for a mere "federal union" between separate bodies sharing a common territory? What can this authorisation of ministries mean which does not involve the total committal to one another in organic union of the divided churches?

One cannot but feel that the very suggestion of "taking episcopacy into" other systems as a proper beginning on the way to Church Union was based on a defective theory of the nature of Church and ministry, and one regrets that thereby this blind alley proposal continues to pre-occupy so many sincere seekers after visible unity. Any such search, which turns aside from the real demand of total committal in a single fellowship to seek a mere change in Church polity seems bound to prove abortive.

W. S.

Islam in India and Pakistan, by Murray Titus (Revised 1959; published for the Senate of Serampore College by the CLS; No. 20 of the Christian Students' Library; price Rs 3. 75.)

This book is a revised reprint of Dr. Titus' **INDIAN ISLAM** first published in 1930 by the CLS Madras. It was then well received and widely used by students and missionaries all over India and abroad. A revision of the book, bringing it up to date is to be welcomed. Thirty years ago Dr. Titus had hoped that his book would be an introduction to a further and fuller study of the subject by others. Unfortunately not much has been written. Especially is it disappointing that Muslim writers have not taken up the subject seriously. Mufti Shaukai Ali Fahmi has written some books in Urdu on the history of Islam in India. But they are largely of a defensive nature, purporting to show that non-Muslim historians have falsely painted the Muslim rulers of India in dark colours. He is at pains to show that the Muslim rulers of India were sympathetic, generous and friendly to their Indian subjects and that their rule did more justice to the common man than the so called secular governments of today. Dr. Titus' account of the early Muslim invaders of India and their motives in undertaking their expeditions are well analysed and documented. It is as fair a narrative of the historical events as it is possible for a non-Muslim to give. He is appreciative of the great contribution Islam has made to the cultural, social and religious life of India. He agrees with Arnold when the latter says, "It is this absence of class prejudices which constitutes the real strength of Islam in India, and enables it to win so many converts from Hinduism." Dr. Titus' assessment, however, that the bigotry and narrow mindedness of the lay leaders (Mullas) has kept the bulk of the Muslim community in ignorance and backwardness, is a true one and is acknowledged by many modern Muslims themselves. This will be apparent from the chapters on Modern Movements and New Muslim Apologetics and Polemics. Dr. Titus also shows that while Islam has influenced Hinduism it has itself been influenced by it. The influence of the Indian caste feeling is perhaps reflected in the class distinctions of Sayyad, Shaikh, Mughal and Pathan among Muslims. These distinctions do not of course correspond to the four castes of Hinduism, but there is no doubt that the Islamic caste-lessness has to

some extent been compromised in India.

In one respect even the latest revision of the book is already out of date in 1960. Pakistan has undergone dramatic and radical changes in its political life during the last twelve years. The Constitution to which Dr. Titus refers is now a dead letter. Pakistan is now under a benevolent military dictatorship and it is not at all clear what shape its political and religious life will take in the future. There are certain reform tendencies appearing in Pakistan which show that whatever happens Pakistan is not going to be an Islamic State in the traditional sense. This has aroused both fears and hopes in the hearts of Muslims of India, according as they are conservative or progressive. The time has not yet come to pass a judgement on the Islam in Pakistan.

In India too a strong 'protestant' movement has come into being, such as represented by Asaf A. A. Fyzee. Dr. Titus does not seem to have taken notice of this as he has been out of India for some years now. It is difficult to keep pace with events in a fast changing India today.

Islam in India and Pakistan has a good bibliography and a useful glossary of terms at the end of the book.

Along with the Rev. L. Bevan Jones' *People of the Mosque* Dr. Titus' book is a simple but adequate introduction to the study of Islam in India.

Emmanuel Sadiq.

The Faith We Confess, by Rev. William Stewart, (published by the CLS, Madras. Price Re. 1.00)

This book (44 pages, with a plain but attractive format) is an exposition of the twelve articles in the Confession of Faith of the UCNI. Without attempting detailed explanation, the author selects essential aspects of each Article and briefly, but forcefully brings out the meaning, with a liberal use of illustration. Another commendable feature is the wealth of apt quotation from Scripture. These quotations are not cumbersome, but delightfully part of the warp and woof of the exposition.

Church members will find the book lucid and helpful, while theologians will enjoy its

freshness, pausing thoughtfully at many stimulating points. For instance, does man cease to be "in the image of God", even through sin? (See page 14, 10 lines from bottom.) Again, would we consider the expression "Sacrament of Joy" an apt description for Holy Communion? (See pp. 34, 35.) Paragraph headings in bold type further enhance clarity and readability.

In addition to a few printing errors the book has some minor defects,—which should not be allowed to detract from its real value. Despite its brevity I think it suffers occasionally from an undue labouring of certain points; and it would probably be better off without some of the quotations from other authors. A slight lack of uniformity is evident in that the first two chapters have Scripture references given mainly in the text; thereafter they appear in the margin. Finally, I feel that in a few instances a point worthy of comment has been missed. I would have welcomed some

emphasis on the importance of giving, in chapter 11; also some comment on the last paragraph in Article X concerning those who administer the Sacrament. However, we appreciate that a short exposition of this kind has to be strictly selective; and in this respect the author has succeeded remarkably well.

The UCNI's Confession of Faith is good,—but in certain respects not easy for the average Church member. Apart from its Elizabethan style, Article IX, for instance, largely reproduces the complicated sentences of Ephesians Chapter 1 in the King James Version. The Book certainly gives a clearer understanding of the important parts of the Confession; and I have personally enjoyed reading it. With minor alterations, a translation into vernacular would also serve a valuable purpose, for many Church members will not have access to the English.

Bruce Henry.

Baptism.

Baptism and the gifts it confers are characterized by a certain finality. The baptism of Christ can never be repeated. It is just this finality and uniqueness which the Epistle to the Hebrews is trying to express in that obscure passage about the impossibility of a second repentance after baptism and conversion (Heb.6:4ff). By baptism we are made partakers in the death of Christ. Through our baptismal death we have been condemned to death and have died, just as Christ died once and for all. There can be no repetition of his sacrifice, therefore the baptized person dies in Christ once and for all. Now he is dead. The daily dying of the Christian life is merely the consequence of the one baptismal death, just as the tree dies after its roots have been cut away. Henceforth the law which governs the life of the baptized is: 'Likewise reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin' (Rom.6:11). From now on the baptized can know themselves only as dead men, in whom everything necessary for salvation has already been accomplished. The baptized live, not by a literal repetition of this death, but by a constant renewal of their faith in the death of Christ as his act of grace in us. The source of this faith lies in the once-and-for-allness of Christ's death, which they have experienced in their baptism.

As far as infant baptism is concerned, it must be insisted that the sacrament should be administered only where there is a firm faith present which remembers Christ's deed of salvation wrought for us once and for all. That can only happen in a living Christian community. To baptize infants without a Church is not only an abuse of the sacrament, it betokens a disgusting frivolity in dealing with the souls of the children themselves. For baptism can never be repeated.

D. Bonhoeffer: *The Cost of Discipleship* E.T. pp. 209f.

Writers in this Number

Rev. Andrew Holderreed, of the Church of the Brethren, is a member of the delegation of that Church on the Negotiating Committee. He is on the staff of the United Theological College, Poona.

Rev. David Lyon, a minister of the UCNI and a missionary of the Church of Scotland, is a member of the Allipur Community in the Wardha District.

Rev. F. Wyld, a priest of the CIPBC, is chaplain in Tezpur, Assam.

Rev. S. Estborn, of the Swedish Lutheran Church, is on the staff of Gurukul Theological College and Research Institute, Madras.

Book Reviews are by Rev. D. H. S. Lyon, Rev. Emmanuel Sadıq, Rev. Bruce Henry, and Rev. W. Stewart.

